UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,760	08/25/2003	Kevin P. Baker	9491-066-27 CONT	3620

7590 06/13/2005

Supervisor, Patent Prosecution Services
PIPER RUDNICK LLP
1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-2412

EXAMINER	
MURPHY, JOSEPH F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1646	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/646,760	BAKER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph F. Murphy	1646	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 April 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *26-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *26-29 and 32-38* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *30-31, 39-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Formal Matters

Claims 26-40 are pending and under consideration.

Response to Amendment

The rejection of claims 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, has been obviated by Applicant's amendment and is thus withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 26, 32-38 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as lacking enablement, has been obviated by Applicant's amendment and is thus withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 26, 32-38 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as lacking written description, has been obviated by Applicant's amendment and is thus withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 34-35 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a host cell in culture comprising a polynucleotide with the sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO: 3, 7, does not reasonably provide enablement for in vivo transfection, has been obviated by Applicant's amendment and is thus withdrawn.

New and remaining issues are set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 first paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 30-31, 39-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, which is enabling for a nucleic acid encoding a full length HPTK6 protein of SEQ ID NO: 4, 8, or a nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO: 3, 7, or a nucleic acid 90% identical to a nucleic acid encoding SEQ ID NO: 4 wherein the encoded protein has tyrosine kinase activity, does not reasonably provide enablement for a nucleic acid which hybridizes to a nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO: 3, 7. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claims 30-31, 39-40 are overly broad since insufficient guidance is provided as to which of the myriad of nucleic acids encode variant polypeptides which will retain the characteristics of HPTK6. However, Applicants do not disclose any actual or prophetic examples on expected performance parameters of any of the possible muteins of HPTK6. It is known in the art that even single amino acid changes or differences in the amino acid sequence of a protein can have dramatic effects on the protein's function. For example, As an example of the unpredictable effects of mutations on protein function, Mickle et al. teaches that cystic fibrosis is an autosomal recessive disorder caused by abnormal function of a chloride channel, referred to as the cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR) (page 597). Several mutations can cause CF, including the G551D mutation. In this mutation a glycine replaces the aspartic acid at position 551, giving rise to the CF phenotype. In the most common CF mutation, delta-F508, a single phenylalanine is deleted at position 508, giving ride to the CF phenotype. Thus showing that even the substitution or deletion of a single amino acid in the entire 1480 amino acid CFTR protein sequence can have dramatic and unpredictable effects on the function of the protein.

Additionally, it is known in the art that even a single amino acid change in a protein's sequence can drastically affect the structure of the protein and the architecture of an entire cell. For example, Voet et al. (1990) teaches that a single Glu to Val substitution in the beta subunit of hemoglobin causes the hemoglobin molecules to associate with one another in such a manner that, in homozygous individuals, erythrocytes are altered from their normal discoid shape and assume the sickle shape characteristic of sickle-cell anemia, causing hemolytic anemia and blood flow blockages (pages 126-128, section 6-3A and page 230, column 2, first paragraph). Additionally, Yan et al. teaches that in certain cases, a change of two-amino acid residues in a protein results in switching the binding of the protein from one receptor to another (Yan et al., Two-amino acid molecular switch in an epithelial morphogen that regulates binding to two distinct receptors. *Science* 290: 523-527, 2000). Since the claims encompass nucleic acids encoding variant polypeptides and given the art recognized unpredictability of the effect of mutations on protein function, it would require undue experimentation to make and use the claimed invention. See In re Wands, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. The test of enablement is not whether any experimentation is necessary, but whether, if experimentation is necessary, it is undue. While the Specification discloses that the encoded polypeptide functions in the chondrocyte re-differentiation assay, the claims do not set forth a functional limitation for the nucleic acids encoding the variant polypeptides and since the amino acid sequence of a polypeptide determines its structural and functional properties, and the predictability of which amino acids can be substituted is extremely complex and outside the realm of routine experimentation, because accurate predictions of a polypeptide's structure from mere sequence data are limited. Since detailed information regarding the structural and functional requirements

of the polynucleotide and the encoded polypeptide are lacking, it is unpredictable as to which variations, if any, meet the limitations of the claims. Applicant is required to enable one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention, while the claims encompass polynucleotides and encoded polypeptides which the specification only teaches one skilled in the art to test for functional variants. It would require undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed polypeptides. Since the claims do not enable one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed polypeptides, but only teaches how to screen for the claimed polypeptides, and since detailed information regarding the structural and functional requirements of the polypeptides are lacking, it is unpredictable as to which variations, if any, meet the limitations of the claims. Thus, since Applicant has only taught how to test for nucleic acids encoding polypeptide variants of HPTK6, and has not taught how to make nucleic acids encoding polypeptide variants of HPTK6, it would require undue experimentation of one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed polynucleotides.

Applicant has added the limitations wherein the wash conditions employ a denaturing agent and low ionic strength; however, this does not clearly define the metes and bounds of the claims, as set forth below. In addition, the claims are not definite because they recite that the nucleic acid has tyrosine kinase activity, however, the encoded protein would have the activity (see infra). Given the indefinite nature of the claims as written, it would require undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

Claims 30-31, 39-40 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

The claims are drawn to a nucleic acid which hybridizes to a nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO: 3, 7 and are thus genus claims. The specification and claim do not indicate what distinguishing attributes shared by the members of the genus. The specification and claims do not place any limit on the number of amino acid substitutions, deletions, insertions and/or additions that may be made to the encoded HPTK6 variants. Thus, the scope of the claim includes numerous structural variants, and the genus is highly variant because a significant number of structural differences between genus members is permitted. The specification and claim do not provide any guidance as to what changes should be made. Structural features that could distinguish compounds in the genus from others in the nucleic acid class are missing from the disclosure. No common structural attributes identify the members of the genus. The general knowledge and level of skill in the art do not supplement the omitted description because specific, not general, guidance is what is needed. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, SEQ ID NO: 3, 7 encoding SEQ ID NO: 4, 8 is insufficient to describe the genus. The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by

disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, i.e. structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. In the instant case, the specification fails to provide sufficient descriptive information, such as definitive structural or functional features of the genus of polynucleotides. There is no description of the conserved regions which are critical to the structure and function of the genus claimed. There is no description of the sites at which variability may be tolerated and there is no information regarding the relation of structure to function. Furthermore, the prior art does not provide compensatory structural or correlative teachings sufficient to enable one of skill to isolate and identify the polynucleotides and polypeptides encompassed. Thus, no identifying characteristics or properties of the instant polypeptides are provided such that one of skill would be able to predictably identify the encompassed molecules as being identical to those instantly claimed. One of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe the genus. Thus, applicant was not in possession of the claimed genus.

Applicant has added the limitations wherein the wash conditions employ a denaturing agent and low ionic strength; however, this does not clearly define the metes and bounds of the claims, as set forth below. In addition, the claims are not definite because they recite that the nucleic acid has tyrosine kinase activity, however, the encoded protein would have the activity (see infra). Given the lack of a definite function, and the indefinite nature of the claims, one of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative

number of species to describe the genus. Thus, applicant was not in possession of the claimed genus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 second paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 30-31, 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 30-31 are directed to "nucleic acid molecules having tyrosine kinase activity". This is vague and indefinite because the nucleic acid will not have this activity, but the encoded protein would. This rejection could be overcome by adding a limitation clarifying that the encoded protein has the tyrosine kinase activity. Claims 39-40 are rejected insofar as they depend from claims 30-31.

Claims 30-31 recite the term "stringent hybridization conditions", which is a conditional term and renders the claim indefinite. Furthermore, some nucleic acids which might hybridize under conditions of moderate stringency, for example, would fail to hybridize under conditions of high stringency. The metes and bounds of the claim thus cannot be ascertained. This rejection could be obviated by supplying specific conditions supported by the specification which Applicant considers to be "stringent". Claims 39-40 are rejected insofar as they depend on the recitation in claims 30-31 of "stringent hybridization conditions". Applicant has added the limitations wherein the wash conditions employ a denaturing agent and low ionic strength,

however, this does not clearly define the metes and bounds of the claims. This rejection could be obviated by adding the wash and hybridization conditions, as set forth, for example, on page 19, lines 6-17 of the Specification.

Conclusion

Claims 26-29, 32-38 are allowable.

Claims 30-31, 39-40 are rejected.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Advisory Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Murphy whose telephone number is (571) 272-0877. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30 am to 5:00 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tony Caputa, can be reached on (571) 272-0829.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joseph F. Murphy, Ph. D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1646
June 1, 2005